

REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, 38, 40-53, 55 and 56 are now pending in the application, with Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33 and 41-44 being independent. Claims 2, 3, 7, 10, 11, 15, 18, 19, 23, 26, 27, 31, 34, 35 and 39 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33 and 41-44 have been amended herein.

In the Office Action dated April 18, 2006, Claims 41-44 and 50-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,549,947 (Suzuki)<sup>1</sup>. Claims 1, 8, 9, 16, 17, 24, 25, 32, 33, 40 and 45-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,885,010 (Kim) in view of Suzuki. Claims 2, 10, 18, 26 and 34 were rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Kim and Suzuki, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,885,478 (Salgado et al.). Claims 3, 6, 11, 14, 19, 22, 27, 30, 35, 38, 55 and 56 were rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Kim and Suzuki, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,816 (Van Buren et al.).

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the Office Action notes in paragraph 4 that Claims 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,885,010 (Kim), in subsequent paragraph 5 the detailed discussion of the rejection refers to Suzuki. For the purposes of this response, Claims 41-44 will be presumed to have been rejected under § 102 in view of Suzuki, not Kim. In paragraph 7 and 8, Kim is referred to with regard to the rejections of Claims 50-53. Apparently, these claims should have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 under Kim and Suzuki.

Claims 5, 7, 13, 15, 21, 23, 29, 31, 37 and 39 were rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Kim and Suzuki, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,936 (Hirabayashi). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Suzuki describes a print system including a host computer. Upon detection of occurrence of a print result error on the basis of a reply from a printer, a print monitor of the host computer can transmit a page end declaration and transmit a job termination declaration to suspend the current print job. Applicants submit that in Suzuki, the printer cannot stop a printing operation of a print job if the print job has a plurality of pages. On the contrary, Suzuki is not believed to disclose or suggest at least stopping, if determined that notification of print cancellation has been received, generation of print job data, and transferring predetermined data indicating end of print job to a printing apparatus, with the printing apparatus deleting print job data until the predetermined data will be received, as is recited in independent Claims 41-44.

Thus, Suzuki fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in independent Claims 41-44.

Kim relates to a printer that includes a forced stop switch that can be pressed to stop a print output immediately. As understood by Applicants, when a user presses the forced stop switch, the printer transmits an error signal to a computer and the printer stops the printing operation and deletes the print data having been stored in the print buffer. However, Applicants further submit that Kim merely deletes print data having been

received from the computer when the forced stop switch is pressed. Kim does not wait to receive data indicating an end of the print job from the computer.

Accordingly, Kim fails to disclose or suggest at least deleting, after issuance or input of a print cancel instruction, print data received until predetermined data (indicating end of a print job) will be received from a host computer, as is recited in independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 33.

Thus, Kim fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 33.

Suzuki is not believed to remedy the deficiencies of Kim noted above with respect to those independent claims.

The remaining citations have been reviewed, but are not believed to be any more relevant than those discussed above.

Thus, independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33 and 41-44 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33 and 41-44. Dependent Claims 5, 6-8, 13, 14, 16, 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, 32, 37, 38, 40, 45-53, 55 and 56 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowability is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Williamson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW/agm

DC\_MAIN 240982v1